

**REMARKS**

The Examiner's Action mailed on July 1, 2008, has been received and its contents carefully considered.

The Examiner's Action has rejected claims 1, 2 and 6-8 as being obvious over *Ahn* (USP 6,519,047) in view of *Jackson et al.* (USP 5,624,196) (hereafter simply *Jackson*). It is submitted that these claims are patentably distinguishable over the cited references for at least the following reasons.

Independent claim 1 is directed to a multi-functional peripheral that includes a recording media path, a scanning module on the recording media path, a printing module on the recording media path, and guiding means on the recording media path and on two sides of the printing module. The guiding means includes at least **two rollers between the printing module and the scanning module**. These features reduce the size of the peripheral device and simplify the design. The claimed invention is not disclosed or suggested by the cited references.

*Ahn* is directed to a multifunctional machine that includes, *inter alia*, a printing unit 11, a scanning unit 16, a base frame 20, and rollers 22 (see *Ahn*, Figures 1 and 4). The Examiner equates the rollers 22 disclosed by *Ahn* with the claimed two rollers.

In the Response to Arguments portion of the Action, the Examiner asserts that *Ahn*'s rollers 22 could be located between the units 11 and 16. Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

As shown in *Ahn's* Figure 4, the base frame 20 is located between *Ahn's* rollers 22 (see col. 9, lines 14-15). Further, at the upper and lower part of *Ahn's* base frame 20, the printing unit 11 and the scanning unit 16 are established, **facing each other** (see col. 5, lines 45-47, Figures 1 and 4). Therefore, if the rollers 22 were to be located between the scanning unit 16 and the printing unit 11, such roller 22 would block the light (emitted from a light source of the scanning unit 16) from being radiated on a document 10. Thus, *Ahn's* rollers 22 cannot be located between the printing unit 11 and the scanning unit 16. In other words, the positional relationship between *Ahn's* scanning and printing units 16 and 11 (that face each other) teaches away from locating *Ahn's* rollers 22 between the printing unit 11 and the scanning unit 16. Accordingly, *Ahn* does not disclose or suggest the two rollers, as recited in claim 1.

*Jackson* does not overcome the above-noted deficiencies of *Ahn*, and thus claim 1 is *prima facie* patentable over the cited references.

Because claims 2 and 6-8 depend from claim 1, these claims are *prima facie* patentable over the cited references for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is patentable, as well as for the additional features recited therein.

For example, claim 7 further recites that the scanning module and the printing module are spaced apart from each other along the recording media path in a direction along which the recording media moves, and claim 8 further recites that the scanning module and the printing module face the same side of the

recording media path. The Examiner acknowledges that the cited references do not disclose this location of the scanning module and the printing module recited in claims 7 and 8. However, the Examiner rejects claims 7 and 8, asserting that Applicant's disclosure has not disclosed that positioning the scan head and the print head on one side provides an advantage, or is used for a particular purpose, or solves a stated problem. Applicant respectfully disagrees for the following reasons.

As illustrated by way of an example in Fig. 2, the two modules 40 and 30 are spaced apart from each other along the recording media path 11 in a direction along which the recording media 50 moves. It is well known that the scanning speed is always faster than the printing speed. Thus, when the scanning and printing module are located as recited in claim 7, each module can operate at its own optimized speed, because the claimed two modules that are apart along the path can operate separately from each other.

However, when the scanning head is connected with the printing head as described in *Ahn*, the scanning speed would necessarily be decreased in order to match the printing speed. In addition, *Ahn* aims to simplify the structure of the machine by moving the printhead and the scanner using **one** driving motor (see *Ahn*, Abstract). Thus, the scanning speed in *Ahn*'s machine would be sacrificed to coordinate with the printing speed. Otherwise, a speed-controller is necessary to control the two different speeds involved in the scanning and printing speed,

resulting a more complex structure. Accordingly, the structural feature recited in claim 7 has an advantage that cannot be achieved by the cited references.

Claim 8 depends from claim 7, and thus has the same advantage noted above. In addition, claim 8 further recites that, as is also illustrated by way of an example in Fig. 2, the scanning module 30 and the printing module 40 face the same side of the recording media path 11. The operation of the claimed multifunctional peripheral with this positional feature recited in claim 8 is much less complicated than that of the multifunctional machine disclosed by *Ahn*.

When scanning or printing with *Ahn*'s machine, due to the face-to-face positional relationship between the print head 14 and the scanner head 15, users must remember that the scanning side should face down and the printing side should face up (see *Ahn*, Fig. 1). The claimed multifunctional peripheral does not have this problem because the scanning and printing units are disposed on the **same** side of the media path.


Based on the above, it is submitted that this application is in condition for allowance and such a Notice, with allowed claims 1, 2 and 6-8, earnestly is solicited.

Should the Examiner feel that a further conference would help to expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to contact the undersigned counsel to arrange for such an interview.

No fee is believed due. Should any fee be required, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the fee to our Deposit Account No. 18-0002, and advise us accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,

August 12, 2008  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Steven M. Rabin – Reg. No. 29,102  
RABIN & BERDO, PC - Cust. No. 23995  
Facsimile: 202-408-0924  
Telephone: 202-371-8976

SMR/JJ

RESPONSE

10/615,793